



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/163,844 09/30/98 HOFMEISTER C 390-008105-U

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD CT 06430

PM92/0524

EXAMINER

UNDERWOOD, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED:

05/24/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/163844

Applicant(s)

Hofmeister

Examiner

Underwood

Group Art Unit

3652

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/6/2000.
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) NONE is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 19-23 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-16 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18, 24-27 is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claim(s) 24-27 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit:

Detailed Action

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

2. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Fukasawa et al.

Applicant's remarks regarding this rejection have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. First the examiner agrees with applicant that the arms in Fukasawa are independently operated and thus claim 4 has been added to this paragraph. Note this claim is not limited to an arm comprising only two sections. Second the distal arm and middle arm in Fukawasa would be slaved to the proximal arm in that when their motors are held idle they would be rotated relative to the proximal arm when its motor was actuated. As for the rectilinear translation of the wafer into the cassettes of Fukasawa such is inherent or else the wafer would not enter between the parallel sides of the cassette.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit:

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukawasa et al in view of Bacchi et al.

It would have been an obvious substitution of equivalents to substitute an arm utilizing two drives as taught by Bacchi for the arm in Fukasawa. This would have been an obvious substitution of equivalents. This rejection assumes only two arm sections.

6. Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacchi et al in view of newly cited Ohta et al vice versa.

Bacchi discloses the claimed arm.

Ohta discloses arranging cassettes side by side in an arc.

Accordingly it would have been obvious to provide a supply as claimed for Bacchi's arm in view of the teaching in Ohta or to substitute an arm as claimed in Ohta in view of the teaching in Bacchi.

7. Claims 17, 18, 24, 25, 26 and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 6, 7 and 9-23 are allowed.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit:

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner D.

Underwood at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Underwood-Carmen

May 23, 2000

Donald W. Underwood 5/24/00
DONALD W. UNDERWOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER